

1
2
3
4
5 BEFORE THE
6 WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

7 WASHINGTON UTILITIES AND
8 TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION,

9 Complainant,

10 v.

11 MARIA K. LINDBERG,

12 Respondent.

DOCKET NO. UW-101818

ANSWER

13 COMES NOW the Respondent, Maria K. Lindberg, by and through her attorney of record,
14 Richard A. Finnigan, Attorney at Law, and hereby answers the Complaint in this matter as follows:

- 15 1. As to Paragraph 1, it is an introductory paragraph and needs no answer.
16 2. As to Paragraph 2, Respondent is without knowledge as to the truth or falsity of the
17 allegation contained therein and therefore denies the same.
18 3. As to Paragraph 3, Respondent is without knowledge as to the truth or falsity of the
19 allegation contained therein and therefore denies the same.
20 4. The Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 4.
21 5. The Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 5.
22 6. The Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 6.
23 7. The Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 7.
24 8. As to Paragraph 8, this is a re-allegation and it is answered as set forth in 1-7 above.
25
26

ANSWER- 1

Law Office of
Richard A. Finnigan
2112 Black Lake Blvd. SW
Olympia, WA 98512
(360) 956-7001

- 1 9. The Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 9.
- 2 10. As to Paragraph 10, Respondent is without knowledge as to the truth or falsity of the
3 allegation contained therein and therefore denies the same.
- 4 11. As to Paragraph 11, this is a re-allegation and it is answered as set forth in 1-7 above.
- 5 12. Respondent denies that in all cases company's tariff should be followed. In some
6 instances, it is appropriate to provide credits to the benefit of customers.
- 7 13. Respondent has no ability to respond to this allegation. Complainant has not filed
8 sufficient information to be to even begin to respond to this allegation.
- 9 14. As to Paragraph 11, this is a re-allegation and it is answered as set forth in 1-7 above.
- 10 15. RCW 80.28.100 states what it states on its face and this paragraph need not be responded
11 to.
- 12 16. Complainant failed to provide sufficient information to allow Respondent to have any
13 idea what factual information is being alleged and therefore cannot respond.
- 14 17. As to Paragraph 11, this is a re-allegation and it is answered as set forth in 1-7 above.
- 15 18. The Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 18.
- 16 19. The Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 19.
- 17 20. The Respondent admits the allegations contained in Paragraph 20.
- 18 21. RCW 80.04.405 states what it states on its face and this paragraph need not be responded
19 to.
- 20 22. Respondent denies that the request for relief should be granted.
- 21 23. Respondent denies that the request for relief should be granted.
- 22 24. Respondent denies that the request for relief should be granted.
- 23 25. Respondent denies that probable cause exists.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

1
2 26. Complainant's allegation in its Second and Third Causes of Action are so vague and lack
3 sufficient facts to constitute a valid complaint and therefore should be dismissed.

4 27. Complainant's allegations in the Second and Third Causes of Action are so vague as to
5 not allow Respondent to respond and are issued in violation of Respondent's rights of due process.

6 28. Respondent has repeatedly requested assistance from Commission Staff and Commission
7 Staff has not provided that assistance. The Commission's role should be to work to provide a viable
8 resolution to problems. It appears that the Commission is more interested in seeking punishment than in
9 addressing issues. The Commission's failure to respond to reasonable requests for assistance have
10 resulted in detriment to customers.
11

12 Dated this 18th day of April, 2011.

13
14 
15 _____
16 RICHARD A. FINNIGAN, WSB #6443
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26